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UNIT STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES DEPARTMENT OF SOCIETY AND
CONSERVATION THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

These Unit Standards and procedures are intended to be in addition to, and consistent with, those provided in the current collective bargaining agreement. In the event of any omissions or inconsistencies, the terms of the collective bargaining agreement shall be applicable and shall prevail. Additional information can be found on the UM Provost’s website.

University Requirements for Faculty Advancement
Evaluation of faculty members for purposes of promotion, tenure, salary determination, or recommendation for retention shall involve consideration of appropriate University of Montana requirements as well as the Unit Standards of the Department of Society and Conservation.

University requirements are found in the Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 10.110. All full-time and part-time tenured and tenure-track faculty will be evaluated by this process. Non-tenurable faculty who are 0.5 FTE or more for two consecutive semesters or more, excluding summer will also be evaluated through this process (see Provost’s website for additional details on who must be evaluated).

Unit Standards for Faculty Evaluation
This section details the faculty evaluation standards adopted by the Department of Society and Conservation. In addition to defining a process for gathering evaluation data for personnel recommendations, the Department of Society and Conservation seeks to establish a process that emphasizes: (1) The encouragement and recognition of quality performance; (2) Expectations that promote long term, sustainable professional activity and involvement; (3) The facilitation of excellence at the program, departmental, and college level. To achieve these goals, the Department process seeks to establish standards of evaluation that clearly communicate the basis for evaluation while still allowing sufficient flexibility to accommodate the diversity in faculty roles, teaching styles, and disciplinary demands necessary for excellence at the individual as well as the program, departmental, and college level. The Department seeks to establish a process that allows for a meaningful evaluation of performance that does not solely rely on a priori numerical standards. Any faculty member with questions on these evaluation procedures or the Collective Bargaining Agreement should consult the Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee.
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IV. Promotion and Tenure Committee
All recommendations by the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) shall consider the faculty member’s teaching, research/scholarship, and service assignment for a performance period consisting of one or more academic year(s) of record, each running from the first day of the academic year and including fall semester, spring semester, and winter and summer term(s). Decisions on promotion and tenure are considered separately from the annual performance evaluation required for untenured faculty. Criteria used in promotion and tenure decisions are described in sections A and B below.

These Unit Standards assume a workload split of 45% teaching, 45% research, and 10% service. Faculty who have received Chair/department and Dean approval for a different workload split need to explain if/how their FTE split translates into expectations that are different from those outlined here.

A Promotion and Tenure (P&T) committee, a mentoring group of at least two departmental faculty which is distinct from the faculty evaluation process, will be established for each newly hired faculty to help mentor them at least until tenure is granted or denied.

I. Faculty Advancement

A. Tenure

Tenure application will be conducted in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, §9.320.

A faculty member meeting the following criteria will be eligible to apply for tenure:

1. Has completed five years of credited service toward tenure; that is, during the sixth year of credited employment. Not more than three years of creditable service may come from another institution.

2. Has terminal degree appropriate to discipline and position.

3. Has attained minimum academic rank of associate professor, though faculty members may apply for tenure and promotion to associate professor simultaneously.

In addition to attainment of the above status, the candidate for tenure must:

1. Exhibit successful performance and indications of continuing development and professional growth in teaching, research/scholarship, and service activities of at least the level of normal as described in the Evaluations Standards section; and

2. Receive a positive tenure recommendation by vote of a majority of the tenured faculty of the Department of Society and Conservation Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Faculty are expected to actively contribute to research in their fields of study via publishing,
pursuing external research funding, and directing and supporting graduate research. Publishing a minimum of one peer reviewed journal publication per year averaged over the evaluation period is considered to provide sufficient evidence of continuous research productivity. Alternatively, an equivalent combination of peer reviewed book chapters, books, or other scholarly contributions also may be used to demonstrate an acceptable level of research publication (the faculty member needs to make the case for equivalency). There should also be a record demonstrating active pursuit of external research funding and of directing and supporting graduate research.

Teaching must meet workload expectations and should be demonstrably effective both in and outside the classroom (e.g. advising undergraduate research, the scholarly mentoring of graduate students, independent study, etc.). Effectiveness is defined by the requirements for a normal teaching evaluation as listed below in Part II.A.

The candidate should also provide a record of service to the Department, Program(s), College, and University, and their respective discipline that reflects increasingly valuable contributions to the University, beyond the University, and to their field, including recognition by peers.

The Department Chair in consultation with the faculty member being considered for tenure shall solicit letters from anonymous, external reviewers. The faculty member shall provide the Department Chair the names and email addresses of three potential reviewers by June 1st prior to applying for tenure. The Department Chair shall provide the names of four to six potential reviewers to the faculty member to review to make sure no personal conflicts exist; individuals for whom there is a personal conflict will be eliminated from the Chair's list. From the combined list, the Department Chair shall solicit letters from three individuals including at least two from the faculty member's list. External reviewers will be asked to focus on the candidate’s scholarship, focusing on the quality of the work and the overall contribution to the field. The faculty member being considered for tenure may also solicit letters and feedback from current or past graduate students to be submitted to the Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair and included in the evaluation. The Department Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider the letters as part of their evaluation process. If letters from external reviewers are not received, the evaluation will still proceed.

Probationary faculty members who have not attained tenure by the completion of their seventh year of credited employment will be given notice and placed on a one-year, non-renewable contract (CBA, 9.340).

B. Promotion
The following specific criteria must be met regarding each respective type of rank advancement or salary determination as indicated. The appropriate terminal degree is understood to mean the Ph.D. or equivalent, doctoral-level degree, or a terminal degree appropriate to discipline and needs of the position.

a. To Assistant Professor: Requires possession of the appropriate terminal degree or its equivalent and evidence that the applicant will achieve recognition in his/her field of competence beyond The University of Montana.

b. To Associate Professor: Requires four (4) or more years in rank as Assistant Professor (except in unusual circumstances) and possession of the appropriate terminal degree and evidence that the applicant is demonstrating professional growth through making increasingly valuable contributions to the University, beyond the University, and to their field. The scope of evidence for promotion to Associate Professor shall cover the entire probationary period, including any time at other institutions recognized for service toward promotion (and specifically noted in the offer letter).

To attain promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate’s research performance should be demonstrated by publications in peer-reviewed journals and/or in other written forms including but not limited to books, law review journals, and non-written forms such as digital media or film. Excellence in teaching should be demonstrated through the pursuit of activities listed under normal performance for teaching. Service should be demonstrated at the program, department, university, and/or externally, or in some combination thereof.

c. To Professor: Requires five (5) or more years in rank as Associate Professor (except in unusual circumstances) and possession of the appropriate terminal degree and evidence that the applicant has achieved recognition in his/her field of competence beyond The University of Montana.

To attain promotion to full professor, excellence must be demonstrated in research/scholarship, teaching and mentoring, as well as service. The candidate should provide evidence showing increasingly valuable contributions to the University, beyond the University, and to their field, by pursuit of activities listed below in Part II. under above normal for research, teaching, and service. The individual must demonstrate significant contributions to teaching by successfully mentoring the scholarly growth of graduate students and making significant contributions to curricula or programs in the department as well as at the college and university level where appropriate. Evidence for such research, teaching, and service activity includes a continued trajectory of productivity beyond assistant professor, including but not limited to: a) Publications and other scholarly communications of significant contribution to advancing the discipline; b) Substantial teaching effectiveness (content, depth, and delivery), quality, and/or breadth; c)
consultations, reviews, collaborations, and/or committee work that help the discipline/field beyond the university.

C. Salary Recommendations
1. Normal Increment: The performance of a majority of faculty members will generally be evaluated as "normal." They will be expected to grow in value to the institution. Faculty showing a sustained level of active professional involvement in accord with the nature of their appointment will be recommended for a "normal" increment to their salary.
2. Merit Recognition: Above normal performance in at least two of three areas of faculty endeavor (teaching, research/scholarship, or service) or outstanding performance in at least one of those areas. A ranking of below normal in any area precludes the possibility of merit recognition.
3. Less-Than-Normal Increment: The absence of any performance, failure to submit an IPR when required (CBA 10.110), or poor performance of assigned responsibilities within the scope of employment may constitute grounds for less-than-normal increment. It is understood that the absence of performance in any one or two of the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, or service does not justify a less-than-normal increment if the individual has assigned duties solely in the remaining area or areas and the quality of the performance in the remaining area or areas is at least normal and the quantity and quality of contributions in the remaining areas is proportionate to the FTE assigned to those areas.

D. Reappointment
Probationary faculty are not reviewed during their first year of service. A probationary appointee shall not be recommended for renewal after the third or subsequent year of service if performance in two areas of academic endeavor is below normal for two consecutive years or in one area of academic performance for three consecutive years.

II. Evaluation Standards
For normal salary increments or promotion, normal performance is expected in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Evaluation criteria shall include:

A. Teaching
Quality in teaching and student advising is crucial to the mission of the Department of Society and Conservation. All faculty members are expected to maintain high standards in teaching, and to maintain strong, respectful, and mutually beneficial relations with the student body.

Determination of a normal performance is made by the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC). Data from the University of Montana Instructional Assessment System (UMIAS) student evaluation of instruction form (or an equivalent evaluation of teaching performance) and course syllabi shall be provided to assist the FEC in evaluating faculty teaching performance. Except in
extenuating circumstances, faculty are required to administer UMIAS forms to all of their
courses that are 3.0 or greater credits. Other evidence of having achieved a normal level of
performance may include:

- Carrying a teaching load commensurate with assigned responsibilities, comprised of classes
  in the faculty member’s area of expertise and receiving average teaching evaluations based
  on the course evaluation scale;
- Advising an appropriate number of undergraduate students determined relative to the number
  of faculty and number of students in the program;
- Chairing M.S. and/or doctoral committees;
- Serving as a member on graduate committees;
- Pursuit of funding to support graduate students.

Performance in teaching will be deemed **above normal** where the faculty member’s performance
significantly exceeds the requirements for a normal performance. While determination of an
**above normal** standard of performance is made on a case-by-case basis by the FEC, evidence of
having achieved such a level of performance may include:

- Carrying a teaching load significantly greater than that required under the faculty member’s
terms of appointment, with average course evaluations based on the course evaluation scale
in all classes taught;
- Teaching a course with a very high number of student credit hours, as compared with other
courses in the department, college, or university;
- Teaching a course that requires exceptionally lengthy preparation time (e.g. classes with a
  significant lab or field component or that fulfill the upper division writing requirement);
- Teaching Departmental or College courses during winter or summer sessions;
- Obtaining “very good” or “excellent” for overall course evaluation in most classes under a
  normal teaching load;
- Supervision of undergraduate research and/or theses.
- Receiving an outstanding faculty/teaching award;
- Teaching a required class outside of the faculty member’s area of expertise;
- Developing and teaching a new class that enhances the curriculum;
- Improving an existing class through incorporation of additional relevant material, new
  projects, assignments, service-learning, and/or field-trips;
- Implementing high impact learning experiences, including but not limited to field trips and
  field courses, and other active-learning approaches;
- Team teaching courses;
- Incorporating new, innovative and effective instructional techniques beyond the traditional
  lecture-based format;
- Advising a disproportionately large number of undergraduate students relative to program
  size and needs;
• High quality scholarly mentoring of graduate students as defined by graduate student needs;
• Serving on an exceptional number of M.S. or Ph.D. committees.
• Chairing the committee of graduating M.S. or Ph.D. students;
• Receiving funding to support graduate students.
• Substantial efforts to develop a new course, modify an existing course, or provide undergraduate or graduate education opportunities to advance values of justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Performance in teaching will be deemed to be outstanding where the faculty member’s performance was at an unusual and exceptional level that warrants consideration of a merit (assuming at least a normal level of performance in research and service). Outstanding performance can be demonstrated in multiple ways, including but not limited to: exceptional performance in multiple categories listed under above normal, awards at the university level or beyond, and/or an extremely high impact activity or accomplishment.

Performance in teaching will be deemed to be less than normal if the faculty member failed to meet the requirements of a normal performance. Determination of less than normal performance is made on a case-by-case basis by the FEC, and extenuating personal circumstances as defined by the Family Medical Leave Act, Faculty Modified Duty (CBA 11.220) and including bereavement will be taken into consideration.

B. Research/Scholarship

Performance and continued development in research/scholarship are central to the overall mission and vision of the Department of Society and Conservation. Faculty members are expected to conduct scholarly activities, communicate findings, and encourage creative investigation by members of the graduate and undergraduate student body.

Determination of a normal performance is made on a case-by-case basis by the FEC. Performance of research or scholarly activities should be commensurate with assigned responsibilities; it is expected that faculty will remain actively engaged in research and scholarly activities throughout their appointment, although it is recognized that faculty may have different emphasis on research, teaching, and service in any given evaluation period (as specified by their FTE split). Evidence of having achieved such a level of performance may include:

• Written and verbal communication of research/scholarship to the scientific community as well as managers, policy-makers, non-governmental organizations, communities, and/or the public;
• Active support of graduate or undergraduate research activities;
• Design and/or implementation of ongoing research;
• Active pursuit of external funding and/or administration of existing grants.
• Advise 1-2 graduate students
Performance in research will be deemed to be **above normal** where the faculty member’s performance significantly exceeded the requirements for a “normal” performance. While determination of an above normal standard of performance is made on a case-by-case basis by the FEC, evidence of having achieved such a level of performance may include:

- Performance of extensive research or scholarly activities;
- Evidence of research or scholarly activity that influences policy direction, management and conservation activities, collaborative problem solving, community well-being, or public understanding;
- Receipt of research awards, honors, or fellowships;
- Contribution to the implementation and success of graduate research at a level or quality that exceeds normal expectations;
- Advise or mentor a large number of graduate research activities;
- Active pursuit of external support from highly competitive funding agencies;
- Receipt of funding from highly competitive funding sources;
- Receipt of funding from less competitive or non-competitive funding sources;
- Active engagement in interdisciplinary or team science;
- Research with significant stakeholder engagement;
- Efforts to ensure that research results are communicated to a broad audience.

Performance in research will be deemed to be **outstanding** where the faculty member’s performance is at an unusual and exceptional level that warrants consideration of a merit (assuming at least a normal level of performance in teaching and service). Outstanding performance can be demonstrated in multiple ways, including but not limited to: exceptional performance in multiple categories listed under above normal, awards at the university level or beyond, and/or an extremely high impact activity or accomplishment.

Performance in research will be deemed to be of a **less than normal** performance if the faculty member failed to meet the requirements of a normal performance. However, extenuating personal circumstances (as defined by the Family Medical Leave Act, Faculty Modified Duty CBA 11.220 and including bereavement, etc.) will be taken into consideration before assigning a below normal performance evaluation.

**C. Service**

Faculty members are expected to constructively engage in department, program, college, and university activities as well as outreach activities that engage students, colleagues, the university, the profession, and the public at large. It is expected that faculty will, throughout their period of
appointment, actively provide internal and external service. If the faculty member has a substantial administrative assignment specified in their job description/work-plan, then evidence of quality of performance for those duties should be included within this section.

Determination of a **normal** performance is made on a case-by-case basis by the FEC. Evidence of having achieved such a level of performance may include:

For departmental, program, and college-level service:
- Active participation in faculty meetings;
- Active participation on departmental, program, and college-level committees;
- Active mentoring of untenured faculty.

For university-level service
- Active participation on university committees or initiatives;

For external professional service:
- Facilitation of local, national, or international conferences, workshops, or equivalent;
- Peer reviewing journal submissions, grant proposals, agency reports, or equivalent scholarly contributions.
- Reviewing journal submissions, grant proposals, agency reports, external tenure and promotion reviews, external academic reviews, or equivalent scholarly contributions.

Performance in service will be deemed to be of **above normal** where the faculty member’s performance significantly exceeded the requirements for a normal performance. While determination of an above normal standard of performance is made on a case by case basis by the FEC, evidence of having achieved such a level of performance may include:

- Chairing the FEC committee;
- Participation in the organization of conferences, symposia, or lecture series;
- Serving as chair and/or discussant at a conference;
- Significant participation in professional societies;
- Chair of a College or University committee or task force;
- Evidence of exceptional administrative service, exceeding minimal requirements of administrative position;
- Editing symposia volumes, proceedings, or journals;
- Serving on the editorial board for a peer reviewed journal;
- Receipt of awards and honors or other special recognition for service activity;
- Significant outreach to or engagement with the community or general public (e.g. public workshops, field trips, public lectures, work with media, nonstudent education);
- Technology transfer outside of university;
- Significant administrative activity, such as playing a leadership role in developing new programs for the department or significant committee work;
- Member or facilitator of a collaborative planning/decision making group;
• Serving on the Board of Directors for community organizations related to the profession;
• Other types of significant service/community activities/civic engagement related to the profession;
• Special assignments with significant time commitments;
• Volunteer consulting activities when it includes any of the above within and outside the university.
• Substantial leadership and service to advance values of justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion within the Department, College, University, and beyond.

Performance in service will be deemed to be \textbf{outstanding} where the faculty member’s performance is at an unusual and exceptional level that warrants consideration of a merit (assuming at least a normal level of performance in teaching and service). Outstanding performance can be demonstrated in multiple ways, including but not limited to: exceptional performance in multiple categories listed under above normal, awards at the university level or beyond, and/or an extremely high impact activity or accomplishment.

Performance in service will be deemed to be \textbf{less than normal} if the faculty member failed to meet the requirements of a normal performance. However, extenuating personal circumstances (as defined by the Family Medical Leave Act, Faculty Modified Duty CBA 11.220 and including bereavement, etc.) will be taken into consideration before assigning a below normal performance evaluation.

\section*{III. Procedures for Faculty Evaluation}

\textit{A. Individual Performance Record (October 15)}

1. Each faculty member shall submit FEC documentation to the Chairperson of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) by October 15\. Evidence shall be submitted to cover appropriate time periods as stated in the CBA and in this document.

2. The submitted scope of evidence shall include the individual performance record (IPR), course syllabi, UMIAS quantitative course evaluation summaries, PDFs of relevant publications, a full CV, and an accompanying memo. The memo should highlight the faculty member's activities and communicate to the FEC the growth, direction, and/or vision of the faculty member's professional activities during the evaluation period. Each page shall be numbered in sequence and the last page dated and signed by the faculty member.

Publications listed as \textit{In Press} or \textit{Accepted} may be included in the IPR; those listed as \textit{Submitted} or \textit{In Preparation} may not. Publications cannot be listed one year as “In Press” and the next with a publication date as if they were different papers. Consequently, papers listed for any action
(hire, merit, tenure, or promotion) may not be listed in a subsequent evaluation unless the time period assessed for the subsequent action overlaps with the previous evaluation (for example, promotion may include papers listed for merits during the time under consideration).

The period of review shall consist of the following:

a. For recommendation for promotion, documentation shall cover every year of service in the current rank in the position served at UM plus credited service, or the most recent seven (7) sequential years, whichever is less. (CBA10.220).

b. For recommendation for tenure, the documentation shall cover the entire probationary period, including credited prior service (and specifically noted in an offer letter).

c. For recommendation for merit, documentation shall cover the time since the documentation was prepared for the last granted merit or promotion, or the most recent seven (7) sequential years, whichever is less. Faculty members may request that evaluative emphasis be placed on the most recent two years of performance.

d. For recommendation for normal or less-than-normal increment, documentation shall cover the record of the previous year(s) as appropriate (see Section 10.340).

3. Relevant evidence from other sources may be added by the FEC, Chair, or Dean as part of the record. The faculty member will be informed of the additional evidence and can formally respond in writing to the addition of the evidence (CBA section 10.220). No individual to be evaluated may be sanctioned, suspended, disciplined, or discharged for failure to comply with a request to provide additional information, as described in CBA Section 10.220.

4. Evidence submitted by an official Student Evaluation Committee, as described in CBA section 10.220, may be made part of the record.

B. Student Evaluation Committee (October 15).

See CBA §10.230 for composition and responsibilities of SEC. The evaluation process may proceed without participation by the SEC. If the SEC is convened to evaluate the faculty, each written SEC evaluation shall be signed by the chairperson of the Student Evaluation Committee and the faculty member being evaluated by October 15.

C. Faculty Evaluation Committee (November 15)

The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consist of all departmental faculty members (including adjunct instructors and research faculty who are .5 FTE of greater), excluding the Departmental Chair. The Faculty Evaluation Committee may select a subcommittee to complete the initial review and draft recommendations. However, the full FEC will review all FEC submissions as well as review and edit all FEC letters.

All faculty members excluding the Department Chair may participate in FEC deliberations. In
tenure decisions, only tenured faculty may vote, regardless of rank. In promotion decisions, only faculty members who hold positions at or above the rank being sought may vote. All members of the FEC may vote in merit/normal decisions. A quorum, defined as a majority of faculty members eligible to vote on an action, is necessary for any vote. Faculty members on sabbatical or leave of absence shall not be counted when determining a quorum. Voting will be conducted by anonymous ballot.

As stipulated in CBA 10.240, when FEC action is complete, each faculty member will be informed in writing of the recommendation and the FEC comments. Within 10 days of receipt of the FEC recommendation, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the FEC regarding any aspect of the FEC’s recommendation or process, as described per CBA §10.240.

D. Evaluation by Department Chair (December 15)

1. The Department Chair shall prepare a recommendation for each faculty member by December 15th, separate from that of the FEC.
2. Prior to the time the Chair forwards to the Dean the record of a faculty member containing the Chair's recommendation, the faculty member shall sign the recommendations of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair's recommendation to signify he/she has read them and acknowledges the presence of the supporting documents. The signature does not signify the faculty member's endorsement of the recommendations. Within 10 days of receipt of the department chairperson’s recommendation, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the department chairperson regarding any aspect of the chairperson’s recommendation or process, as per CBA §10.250.

E. Evaluation by the Dean (February 15)

As specified in CBA §10.260. Within 10 days of receipt of the evaluation record from the Dean, any faculty member may submit a written appeal to the Dean regarding any aspect of the evaluation record or process including the Dean’s professional opinion. The appeal must state any matters which the Dean is requested to consider as well as the remedial action desired, as described per CBA §10.270.